1	REMARKS

	2	Applicants have amended the claims to point out with more clarity the difference with
	3	the references. The limitations of claim 1 have been inserted into claims 4 and 5.
	4	With respect to claim 4, Applicants have amended the claim to specify that the
	5	hierarchy is one of triggering actions, so that "centering", the lower action, is within the
	6	scope of "passing", the higher action, the soccer ball. Support is found on page 11, lines
•	7	7 - 14.
		well and the claim of Amelicante point out that the claim refers to a composite
	8	With respect to claim 5, Applicants point out that the claim refers to a composite
	9	triggering action composed of two related actions. Support is provided by the last
	10	paragraph in page 25; p.11, lines 15 - 20; and p. 13, lines 4 - 12.
	11	Claims 24 - 27 specify more detail of the calculation which, as discussed above, is not
	12	taught by either reference.
	13	Claims 28 - 34 are Beauregard claims that track the method claims they refer to.
	14	Claims 35 - 40 add further limitations to claims 4 and 5.

1	For the foregoing reasons, allowance of the claims is respectfully solicited.	
2 3	Respectfully submitted,	
4 5 6 7	by: Eric W. Petraske, Attorney Registration No. 28,459 Tel. (203) 798-1857	